



Quality of Life among Street Vendors in Tiruchirappalli City, Tamil Nadu, India

R. Karthikeyan and R. Mangaleswaran

Department of social work, Bharathidasan University, Tiruchirappalli, Tamil Nadu, INDIA

Available online at: www.isca.in, www.isca.me

Received 28th October 2013, revised 10th November 2013, accepted 2nd December 2013

Abstract

Informal Sector is the most important part of the workforce in India and other developing countries works. It has become a progressively more popular subject of study, not just in economics, but also in Social Work, Sociology and Anthropology. The term of "Informal Sector" was first coined by Keith Hart. There are many informal sectors in our country working for their own livelihood. The most frequently and regularly they have to work to earn their daily bread. After the implementation of Liberalisation, Privatization and Globalization there are several changes in the system and particularly with respect to the informal sectors belonging to Street Vendors. With this background, the researchers intended to study the socio-economic status and quality of life among the Street Vendors in Tiruchirappalli District, Tamil Nadu. There many Street Vendors in the heart city of Tiruchirappalli, hence the researchers used convenient sampling method to select 56 respondents for the present study and the study is descriptive in nature. The findings of the study are elaborated in the full paper. The government and non-governmental organization has to play a crucial role for the development of Street Vendors. Further few suggestions were also given to enhance their quality of work life.

Keywords: Street vendors, informal sectors, socio-economic and quality of life.

Introduction

India is one of the developing countries in the world and it stands second in terms of population in the world, hence, our government is not able to give jobs for all people. The majority of the people are migrated from rural to urban areas. The urban areas have all the speciality and job opportunities in these settings. Some skilled people try to get the white-collar job in the urban region. The literate and illiterate people have to make self-employment through various aspects including informal sectors. This paper attempts to study about the Street Vendors in informal sectors.

Informal/Unorganized Sectors in India: The term informal sector is originally used by W. Arthur Lewis. This term is basically applied for referring to the employment generation in the developing countries. The term Informal sector has been used to describe the working culture of a particular section of the people who are marginalized from the mainstream trading business as a result of modern industrial sector¹.

The term is also useful in describing and accounting for forms of shelter or living arrangements that are similarly unlawful, unregulated, or not afforded protection of the state. 'Informal economy' is increasingly replacing 'informal sector' as the preferred descriptor for this activity¹.

Introduction of Street Vendors: In Indian cities urban sector survive as a result of the work in informal cities. The poverty and lack of profitable employment in the rural area drive the

people to move towards the urban centres. These people are not educated or skilled so they cannot get into the highly paid job in the formal sector. They depend on the informal job mainly for their survival. This has resulted in the rapid growth of informal sector in the various cities. Unlike other formal sectors there is no need for much financial investment for undertaking a business in informal sector Sharit K., Bhowmik² 1998.

About Tiruchirappalli: Tiruchirappalli (Trichy) lies at the heart of Tamil Nadu. This city is well attracted tourist centre. Trichy is also called as an industrial town of Tamil Nadu. Since the major industries like BHEL (Bharat Heavy Electricals Limited), OFT (Ordnance Factory Tiruchirappalli), HAPP (Heavy Alloy Penetrator Project) and the Golden Rock Railway work shop etc are situated here. The place is famous for artificial diamonds, cigars, glass bangles and wooden and clay toys.

Tiruchirappalli is administrated by Municipal Corporation established as per the Tiruchirappalli city Municipal Corporation Act 1994. The city covers an area of 4,403.83 square kilometres and has a population of 2,713,858 as per census 2011. The main landmarks are central bus stand (heart of city), Railway Junction, Thillainagar, Subramaniyapuram, Market, Palakarai and Chatram bus stand. The population of Street Vendors is expected to be around 3500 (Mr. Maheshwaran, secretary of Tamil Nadu, NASVI, Trichy, said that all of the 3,500-odd vendors who operate within the 65-ward corporation limits). The researcher has selected the

heart within the city of this corporation limits Government of Tamil Nadu³.

Many Street Vendors are working in this city. The Street Vendors are selling their different types of goods in the platforms. General public are interested to purchase the goods sold by them. Some of the Non Governmental Organizations are giving support to the Street Vendors.

Definition of Street Vendors: According to National Policy on Urban Street Vendors, Department of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation. "A Street Vendor is broadly defined as a person who offers goods or services for sale to the public without having a permanent built up structure but with a temporary static structure or mobile stall (head load)". Street Vendors may be stationary by occupying space on the pavements or other public/private areas, or may be mobile in the sense that they move from place to place carrying their wares on push carts or in cycles or baskets on their heads, or may sell their wares in moving bus etc. In this policy document, the term urban vendor is inclusive of both traders and service providers, stationary as well as mobile vendors and incorporates all other local/region specific terms used to describe them, such as, hawker, pheriwalla, rehri-patri walla, footpath dukandars, sidewalk traders, etc National Policy on Urban Street Vendors 2004⁴.

The First Indian National Commission on Labor (1966-69) defined 'unorganized sector workforce' as – "those workers who have not been able to organize themselves in pursuit of their common interest dues to certain constraints like casual nature of employment, ignorance and illiteracy, small and scattered size of establishments" INCL 1966-69⁵.

Working Pattern of the Street Vendors: Tiruchiraappalli District is one of the largest cities in Tamil Nadu. Most of the Street Vendors are selling the goods like Fruits and Vegetables, Foods, Nuts, Steel, Plastic, Flowers and etc. They have a pattern of selling the goods so to say, in sitting position, bicycle, trolley, walking, sales setting of open places, road side, and door to door. They sell their goods; take the time of 12 or 14 hours per day (8AM- 9PM). In this working time vendors are facing many problems from the public and some police personnel. Their working area is not protected from the harmful weather conditions like heat, rain, dust and lack of storage facilities. So their physical condition severely and causes many disease like body heat, some pimples in body, skin allergic, dust allergic and various psychological problems.

Problem Faced by Street Vendors: The Street Vendors are the most internal working section of the human society. But they are facing lot of problems. Following are the troubles.

Harassment by Police and Local government: Some of the police man is daily collecting the money from the Street Vendors (Rs.10-20). They buy goods from them as free of cost,

and then monthly booked in 2 illegal patty cases. Police man utters bad words to them.

Trading sites too small: The Street Vendors are occupied the small place and they are using some different equipments (transitory). And government announces the tender notifications but they are not interested in participating in the tenders.

Problems with site allocation systems: They have no particular site for vending area. So some vendors occupy their area in early morning and it leads to quarrel between the vendors. Sometimes these problems have been taken to the court.

Lack of facilities (e.g. shelters, storage): Hawkers are not having a permanent place. They move one place to another place, so they are not using cold storage and some safety equipments (umbrella, water and etc...).

Lack of access to credit: The vendors are not able to invest lot of money (capital) for their business, because they have no enough income. This is the very difficult for their future savings.

Lack of (business) skills and education: Every human being is capable in doing work with their skill. Some vendors are entering newly in this work, because they have shy and people are not interested in buying their goods. Some vendors are not educated (below 5th standard), so they loss their money in (some people cheating their goods) business.

National Association of Street Vendors of India (NASVI) - Tamil Nadu: Sali Ora Seru Madtrum Kuru Veyaparikal Sangam (Tiruchirappalli)

National Association of Street Vendors of India (NASVI), its organizer Mr. Maheshwaran, is a secretary, Tamil Nadu of National Association of Street Vendors in India. He started Sali Ora Seru Madtrum Kuru Veyaparikal Sangam in the year of 2006. This organization is working for Street Vendors protection care. This organization is collaborating with the National Association of Street Vendors in India (NASVI) to working with the Street Vendors. This society (Sali Ora Seru Madtrum Kuru Veyaparikal Sangam) use to have monthly contracted the meeting for the Street Vendors. In this meeting Lawyers, Street Vendors and College Students are participated and discus developmental oriented programme to the Street Vendors. This organization is under the following functions⁶.

Functions: i. To give the good guidelines for the Street Vendors. ii. To encourage the Street Vendors to issue licenses. iii. Supporting and solving the judicial level problem for the Street Vendors. iv. To give the loan facilities for the Street Vendors.

Quality of Life: According to World Health Organization (1996) "Quality of life is defined as individuals' perceptions of

their position in life in the context of the culture and value systems in which they live and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards and concerns” WHOQOL-BREF 2004⁷.

Review of Literature: This paper attempts to study the street vendors of the selected seven cities. The main focus of this study is to examine the problems of the street vendors in the urban areas. The scope of this study is not only to explore the street vendors but also to consider the legal status of hawkers. Other major aspects this paper investigates are regarding the contribution of street vendors to the urban economy, the problems faced by them, how the urban population reacts to the hawkers and how they are positioned in the urban society. This study will propose how these problems and concerns of hawkers can be sorted out. The street vendors of Ahmedabad, Bangalore, Bhubaneswar, Calcutta, Imphal, Mumbai and Patna are taken for the examination. The above discussion shows that the hawkers of these selected cities have common features in their work culture. As far as the incomes of the street vendors are concerned they get almost same in all the selected cities. The incomes range from 50 to 100 rupees for male and 35 to 40 for female. The conditions of the hawkers are very worst in Patna Sharit K. Bhowmik² - NASVI, 1998.

Brata Aloysius Gunadi⁸: Conducted a study focusing on the vulnerability of Street Vendors in Java since the time when Java was hit severely by the economic crisis in 1997/1998, which also had reversed the trend of economic formalization in Indonesia. This aspire, a survey was conducted Yogyakarta and Sleman districts in Yogyakarta Special district and 122 Street Vendors in several streets in both areas. These samples consist of three groups of Street Vendors: food seller, non-food seller, and services providers. Based on this survey, vulnerability guide of Street Vendors is measured. The study found that most of Street Vendors in Yogyakarta experience vulnerability at the medium level. In general, vulnerability of food seller vendors is higher than other vendors. Vulnerability also varies across the locations of vending.

Debdulal Saha⁹: Studied the street vendors in terms of their decent work and emphasized that the role of organization /union in providing them the decent work culture. The researcher has taken 200 sample respondents for this study. This study aims at presenting that the street vendors mainly depend on money lenders for their economic and social security purposes. The hawkers take money from the money lenders at the interest of 5-10 percent and it is mainly used for their social security purposes than the economic activities. They final fell into the trap of debt. This study reveals that they work for 14-18 hours a day. There is no safety for the street vendors in their work place. They have to face severe harassment form the local authority like police and Municipal Corporation. The study also discloses the fact that many trade unions and organization are there to help the hawkers but the number of these organizations is very few in number.

Methodology

Statement of the Problem: The informal sectors are considered to be an important factor of the trade association in the world. The Street Vendors can be productive (or) get quality of life through their occupation, because they are not developed in their life status. The factors which are playing important roles enhancing Street Vendor are Social, Ethical, Legal, and Economic. The present study is dealing with various aspects of Street Vendor's socio-economic conditions and quality of life in the heart city of central bus stand in Tiruchirpalli district.

Objectives of the Study: i. To find out the socio-economic conditions of the Street Vendors. ii. To study the quality of life among the respondents. iii. To study the working condition of the Street Vendors. iv. To study the level of awareness among the respondents regarding the policies.

Research Hypothesis: i. There is a significant difference between gender of the respondents and their overall Quality of Life. ii. There is a significant difference between house status of the respondents and their overall Quality of Life. iii. There is a significant variance between Educational Qualification of the respondents and their overall Quality of Life. iv. There is a significant variance between Living Areas of the respondents and their overall Quality of Life. v. There is a significant variance between Types of House of the respondents and their overall Quality of Life. vi. There is a significant variance between Sales Area of the respondents and their overall Quality of Life. vii. There is significant correlation between the age of the respondents and their overall Quality of Life.

Methods and Respondents: The researchers used convenient sampling method to select 56 respondents for the present study and the study is descriptive in nature. This study was conducted from August to December 2012 and this paper presented “XXXI Annual National Conference of Indian Society of Professional Social Work”, 3rd- 5th of January 2013, at Kasturba Medical College, Manipal University Manipal, Karnataka.

Tools for data collection: The information related to the present study was collected through structured interview schedule. The interview schedule consists of different parts namely, socio demographic profile, the personal information which includes age, gender, marital status, caste, educational qualification, occupation, year of experience, income, savings, type of house and ownership of house. The quality of life scale was taken from in the World Health Organization (WHO) - Scoring the WHOQOL-BREF. This scale has 26 questions and 4 dimensions (Physical health, Psychological development, Social relationships and Environment factors).

Results and Discussion

This study was explained through simple table, t-test, ANOVA, Chi-square and Correlation. The following the tables explain

and deeply analyse the various dimension of the variables for the quality of life.

The study of the socio-economic background of the Street Vendors (table-1) revealed that one third of the respondents (34%) are in the age group of 38-47 years, less than one third (31%) of the them where in the age group of 18-27 years, nearly one fourth (24%) of the respondents are of 48-57 years of old. Gender wise distribution of the Street Vendors shows that majority (60%) of them where males and less than half per cent (40%) of the respondents where females. With respect to the educational qualification of the Street Vendors, less than half per cent (45%) of the respondents have completed primary level education and one third (34%) of the respondents where under below primary level education. It was found that only small proportion of the respondents have completed HSC and SSLC. The study depicts that more than half per cent (52%) of the respondents are Hindus, less than half per cent (41%) are Christians and only 7 per cent of the respondents where Muslims. The community wise distribution of the Street Vendors shows that more than one third (38%) of the respondents are from backward community, more than half per cent (29%) of them are from schedule caste, exactly one forth (25%) belong to most backward class and very few per cent (5%) of respondents are from schedule tribe. The marital status of the Street Vendors depicts majority (71%) of the respondents are married, 14 per cent of them are unmarried, 11 per cent of respondents were separated and very few per cent (4%) of the Street Vendors where divorced. It was found that majority (64%) of respondents are living alone and more than one third of the respondents are form joint family.

Table- 1
Socio- economic Background of the Respondents

Variables	Frequency(n=56)	Percentage
1.Age (in year)		
18-28	17	31
28-38	6	11
38-48	20	34
48-58	13	24
2.Sex		
Male	33	60
Female	23	40
3.Education		
HSC	3	5
SSLC	9	16
Above 5 th	19	34
Blow 5 th	25	45
4.Religion		
Hindu	29	52
Christian	23	41
Muslim	4	7
5.Community		
FC	3	5
BC	20	38
MBC	14	25

SC	16	29
ST	3	5
6.Marital Status		
Married	40	71
Unmarried	8	14
Divorcé	2	4
Separate	6	11
7.Type of Family		
Single	36	64
Joint	20	36
8.Nativity		
Rural	17	30
Urban	26	46
Semi-Urban	13	23
9.Type of House		
Hut	7	13
Tin	22	39
Concrete	27	48
10.House Status		
Own	30	54
Rent	26	46
11.Type of Goods		
Vegetables	11	20
Fruits	18	32
Nuts	6	11
Steel	10	20
Plastic	4	7
Others	7	13
12.Sales pattern		
Sitting	16	29
Bicycle	21	38
Trolley	13	23
Walk	6	11
13.Sales Area		
Public places	18	32
Road	23	41
Door to door	15	27
14.Monthly Income (Rs)		
1500-3000	26	46
3001-4500	19	34
4501-6000	11	20
15.Monthly Expenditure (Rs)		
1500-3000	26	46
3001-4500	22	39
4501-5000	8	14
16.Monthly Saving (Rs)		
500- 1000	36	64
1001- 1500	11	20
1501- 2000	9	16

While taking the domicile under consideration it was found that less than half per cent (46%) of the respondents are from

urban area, while more than one fourth (30%) of them are from rural area and less than one fourth (23%) of the respondents are from semi-urban. The findings show that nearly half per cent (48%) of the respondents reside in concrete house, more than one third of them (39%) live in tiled house and 13 per cent of the respondents reside in huts. More than half (54%) per cent of the respondents have their own house and less than half (46%) per cent of the respondents reside in rental house. The panel 11, shows that respondents sales goods, less than one third (32) of the respondents are sales in fruits, both of the (20%) vendors are sales in vegetable and steel, less than one fourth (13%) of the vendors sales in other things (flowers, pen and some news papers), and 7 per cent of the respondents are sales in plastic. It was inferred from the above table that more than one third (38%) of the respondents use bicycle to sell their goods and less than one fourth (23%) use trolley. However, 11 per cent of the respondents go by walk and sell their goods. Panel 13; explain that the respondent's sales area, less than half of the (41%) respondents are like road side, one third of the respondents are like in public places (bus stands, railway junction and in bus), and 27 per cent of the respondents are sales their goods in door to door.

Monthly income wise distribution of the respondent depicts that less than half per cent (46%) of Street Vendors income ranges from Rs. 1500 to 3000/-, one third (34%) of the respondents monthly income was between Rs. 3,001 to 4,500/- and less than one fourth of the respondents monthly income was Rs. 4,501 to 5000/-. With respect to monthly expenditure of the respondents less than half per cent ranges from Rs. 1,500 to 3,000/-, one third (34%) ranges from Rs. 3,001 to 4,500/- and 14 per cent of the respondents monthly expenditure is Rs. 4,501 to 6,000/-. As for as monthly savings of the Street Vendors is concern, majority of (64%) monthly savings ranges from Rs. 500 to 1,000/-, more than one third (39%) ranges from Rs. 1001 to 1,500/- and remaining 16 per cent of the respondents monthly savings is between Rs. 1,501 to 2,000/-.

The above frequency table explain the respondents various dimensions of quality of life. The physical health shows that more than half (55.4%) of the respondent's denoted low level and the remaining 44.6% indicated high level of quality of life in Physical Health. The above panel 2 shows that the psychological health of the respondents with 51.8% declared as low level and the remaining 48.2% of the respondents were having high level. 73.2% of street vendors respondents social relationship was low and the remaining respondents (26.8%) had high level of social relationship. The respondent of environmental factor of quality of life is (55.4%) low and 44.6% was high level. The overall Table 2 clearly explained the variables like Physical Health, Psychological Health, Social Relationship and Environmental Factor and the overall quality of life which was denoted equally (50%) divided with as low and high level.

Table- 2
Distribution of Respondents by their Dimension of overall Quality of Life

S.No	Variables	Frequency (n=56)	Percentage
1	Physical Health		
	low	31	55.4
2	high	25	44.6
	Psychological health		
3	low	29	51.8
	high	27	48.2
4	Social relationship		
	low	41	73.2
5	high	15	26.8
	Environment factor		
6	low	31	55.4
	high	25	44.6
7	Overall Quality of life		
	low	28	50.0
	high	28	50.0

The above table shows that overall quality of life difference between the respondents gender. There is a significant difference between physical health of the score for male (M=81.33, SD=17.224) and female (M=73.22, SD=10.105) condition; $t(54) = 2.015, p(.049) < 0.05$. Panel 2 indicates there is no significant difference between psychological health of male (M= 69.82, SD=13.860) and female (M=66.26, SD=10.708) status; $t(54) = 1.034, p(.306) > 0.05$. Panel 3 shows there is no significant difference between social relationships of male (M=29.94, SD= 7.080) and female (M=30.78, SD= 5.317) condition; $t(54) = -.484, p(.631) > 0.05$. It is evident from Panel 4 that there is a significant difference between environmental factor of male (M=88.24, SD= 16.731) and female (M=79.65, SD= 16.731) condition; $t(54) = 2.105, p(.040) < 0.05$. Panel 5 shows there is a significant difference between overall quality of life of male (M=73.24, SD= 11.048) and female (M=67.87, SD=7.723), condition; $t(54) = 2.137, p(.037) < 0.05$. The Table 3 having four variables. It has depends and denoted the street vendors quality of life. At the same time the physical health and environment factor was highly denoted and equally shared with Street Vendor's quality of life. The above study foremost Hypothesis (H₁) was – There is a significant difference between the gender categories. Hence, it was accepted at 5% significant level as 95% confident level.

Table-3

‘t’ Test between the Male and Female respondents with regard to their various dimensions of their overall Quality of Life

S.No	Sex	Respondents (n:56)		
		Mean	S.D	Statistical Inference
1	Physical Health			
	Male	81.33	17.224	t=2.015 df=54 p(.049)<0.05 Significant
Female	73.22	10.405		
2	Psychological Health			
	Male	69.82	13.860	t=1.034 df=54 p(.306)>0.05 Not Significant
Female	66.26	10.708		
3	Social Relationship			
	Male	29.94	7.080	t=-.484 df=54 p(.631)>0.05 Not Significant
Female	30.78	5.317		
4	Environmental Factor			
	Male	88.24	16.731	t=2.105 df=54 p(.040)<0.05 Significant
Female	79.65	12.115		
5	Overall Quality of life			
	Male	73.24	11.048	t=2.137 df=54 p(.037)<0.05 Significant
Female	67.87	5.723		

Table-4

‘t’ Test between the respondents House Status with regard to their various dimensions of their overall Quality of Life

S.No	House Status	Respondents (n:56)		
		Mean	S.D	Statistical Inference
1	Physical Health			
	Own	77.20	15.082	t=-.419 df=54 p(.677)>0.05 Not Significant
Rent	78.92	15.659		
2	Psychological Health			
	Own	67.60	13.426	t=-.477 df=54 p(.636)>0.05 Not Significant
Rent	69.23	11.961		
3	Social Relationship			
	Own	31.33	7.053	t=-1.330 df=54 p(.189)>0.05 Not Significant
Rent	29.08	5.373		
4	Environment			
	Own	86.13	15.642	t=.734 df=54 p(.466)>0.05 Not Significant
Rent	83.08	15.443		
5	Overall Quality of Life			
	Own	71.23	9.529	t=.165 df=54 p(.870)>0.05 Not Significant
Rent	70.81	9.761		

The above table shows that overall quality of life difference between the respondents house status. There is no significant difference between physical health of the score for own house (M=77.20, SD=15.082) and Rented house (M=78.92, SD=15.659); t (54) = .419, p (.677)>0.05. Panel 2 shows that there is no significant difference between psychological health

of their own house (M= 67.60, SD=13.426) and rent house (M=69.23, SD=11.961); t (54) =.477, p (.636)>0.05. Panel 3 inform that there is no significant difference between social relationship of their own house (M=31.33, SD= 7.053) and rented house (M=29.08, SD= 5.373); t (54) =1.330, p (.189)>0.05. Panel 4 indicates that there is no significant

difference between environmental factor of their own house (M=83.13, SD= 15.642) and rented house (M=83.08, SD= 15.443) condition; $t(54) = .734, p(.466) > 0.05$. Panel 5 highlights that there is no significant difference between overall quality of life of their own house (M=71.23, SD= 9.529) and rent house (M=70.81, SD=9.761), $t(54) = .165, p(.870) > 0.05$. The overall analysis of the above table 4 clearly explained the above all the variables are not significant with Street Vendors quality of life. Hence the research hypothesis (H_1) rejected. So, the null hypothesis accepted (H_0).

G1=HSC, G2=SSLC, G3= Above 5th Standard, G4=Below 5th Standard: A one-way ANOVA was used to test for physical health differences among four types of an educational qualification. Physical health for education found no significantly differences across the four sizes of educational groups, $F(3, 52) = .057, p(.992) > 0.05$. The comparisons of the four groups indicate that the educational groups $M = G1=80.00, G2=76.89, G3=77.89, G4=78.24$, CI 95% [70.06, 89.94]. The psychological health found no differences between the

educational groups $F(3, 52) = .620, p(.539) > 0.05$. The comparisons of the four groups indicate that the educational groups $M = G1=70.67, G2=67.11, G3=71.58, G4=66.08$, CI 95% [64.93, 76.40]. The social relationship comparisons between the educational groups $F(3, 52) = 1.695, p(.923) > 0.05$. The comparisons of the four groups indicate that the educational groups $M = G1=29.33, G2=29.33, G3=30.11, G4=30.88$, CI 95% [17.86, 40.81]. The environmental factor contrast between the educational groups $F(3, 52) = .004, p(.486) > 0.05$. The comparisons of the four groups indicate that the educational groups $M = G1=77.33, G2=79.11, G3=87.37, G4=85.60$, CI 95% [56.65, 98.02]. The overall quality of life Comparisons between the educational groups $F(3, 52) = .135, p(.644) > 0.05$. The comparisons of the four groups indicate that the educational groups $M = G1=69.67, G2=67.89, G3=72.84, G4=70.96$, CI 95% [80.57, 88.86]. The overall analysis of the above Table 5 clearly explained the educational qualification of Street Vendor and variables of quality of life are not significant. Hence the research hypothesis (H_1) rejected. So, the null hypothesis accepted (H_0).

Table-5
 One way analysis of variance among various Education qualifications of the respondents with regard to their overall Quality of Life

S.No	Source	Respondents =56				
		DF	SS	MS	\bar{X}	Statistical Inference
1	Physical Health					
	Between Groups	3	24.762	8.254	G1=80.00 G2=76.89 G3=77.89 G4=78.24	F=.057 p(.992)>0.05 not Significant
Within Groups	52	12743.238	245.062			
2	Psychological Health					
	Between Groups	3	356.830	118.943	G1=70.67 G2=67.11 G3=71.58 G4=66.08	F=.620 p(.539)>0.05 not significant
Within Groups	52	8484.027	163.154			
3	Social Relationship					
	Between Groups	3	20.332	6.777	G1=29.33 G2=29.33 G3=30.11 G4=30.88	F=1.695 p(.923)>0.05 not significant
Within Groups	52	2215.096	42.598			
4	Environment Factors					
	Between Groups	3	599.452	199.817	G1=77.33 G2=79.11 G3=87.37 G4=85.60	F=.004 p(.486)>0.05 not Significant
Within Groups	52	12587.977	242.076			
5	Overall Quality of Life					
	Between Groups	3	156.887	52.296	G1=69.67 G2=67.89 G3=72.84 G4=70.96	F=.135 p(.644)>0.05 not Significant
Within Groups	52	4861.042	93.482			

Table – 6

One way analysis of variance among various Living Areas of the respondents with regard to their overall Quality of Life

S.No	Living Area	Respondents =56				
		DF	SS	MS	\bar{X}	Statistical Inference
1	Physical Health					
	Between Groups	2	605.502	302.751	H1=81.65	F=1.319
	Within Groups	53	12162.498	229.481	H2=78.31	p(.276)>0.05
					H3=72.62	not Significant
2	Psychological Health					
	Between Groups	2	87.301	43.650	H1=67.06	F=.264
	Within Groups	53	8753.557	165.161	H2=68.15	p(.769)>0.05
					H3=70.46	not significant
3	Social Relationship					
	Between Groups	2	88.062	44.031	H1=31.76	F=1.087
	Within Groups	53	2147.367	40.516	H2=30.31	p(.345)>0.05
					H3=28.31	not significant
4	Environment Factors					
	Between Groups	2	1450.524	725.262	H1=91.76	F=3.275
	Within Groups	53	11736.905	221.451	H2=83.38	p(.046)<0.05
					H3=78.15	Significant
5	Overall Quality of Life					
	Between Groups	2	189.347	94.674	H1=73.47	F=1.039
	Within Groups	53	4828.581	91.105	H2=70.73	p(.361)>0.05
					H3=68.46	not Significant

H1=Rural, H2=Urban, H3=Semi-Urban: A one-way ANOVA was used to test for overall quality of life differences among three level of a living area. Physical health for living area do not significantly differ the three sizes of living areas, $F(2, 53) = 1.319, p(.276) > 0.05$. The relationship of the three levels indicate that the living area $M = H1=81.65, H2=78.31, H3=72.62, CI 95\% [74.45, 88.85]$. The panel 2 psychological health for living area do not significantly differ the three sizes of living areas, $F(2, 53) = .264, p(.769) > 0.05$. The comparisons of the three levels indicate that the living area $M = H1=67.06, H2=68.15, H3=70.46, CI 95\% [61.59, 72.53]$. The panel 3 shows that social relationship for living area do not significantly differ the three sizes of living areas, $F(2, 53) = 1.087, p(.345) > 0.05$. The relationship of the three levels indicate that the living area $M = H1=31.76, H2=30.31, H3=28.31, CI 95\% [27.88, 35.64]$. The panel 4 shows the environmental factor for living area do not significantly differ the three sizes of living areas, $F(2, 53) = 3.275, p(.046) < 0.05$. The relationship of the three levels indicate that the living area $M = H1=91.76, H2=83.38, H3=78.15, CI 95\% [84.96, 98.57]$. The overall quality of life for living area do not significantly differ the three sizes of living areas, $F(2, 53) = 3.275, p(.046) < 0.05$. The comparisons of the three levels indicate that the living area $M = H1=73.47, H2=70.73, H3=68.46, CI 95\% [69.30, 77.64]$. The overall analysis of the above Table 6 shows that the Street Vendors living areas were the above four variables except environmental factors are not significantly difference with Street Vendor's quality of life. Hence the research hypothesis (H_1) rejected. So, the null hypothesis accepted (H_0).

R1= Hunt, R2= Tin, R3= Concrete: A one-way ANOVA was used to test for overall quality of life variance among three levels of respondent's type of house. Physical health for type of house do not significantly differ the three ranges of house

types, $F(2, 53) = 2.164, p(.125) > 0.05$. The comparisons of the three levels indicate that the types of house $M = R1=68.00, R2=81.45, R3=77.78, CI 95\% [73.92, 82.08]$. The psychological health for type of house do not significantly differ the three ranges of house types, $F(2, 53) = .249, p(.781) > 0.05$. The comparisons of the three levels indicate that the types of house $M = R1=69.14, R2=69.64, R3=67.11, CI 95\% [64.96, 71.75]$. The panel 3 shows social relationship for type of house do not significantly difference the three ranges of house types, $F(2, 53) = .351, p(.706) > 0.05$. The comparisons of the three levels indicate that the types of house $M = R1=28.57, R2=30.91, R3=30.22, CI 95\% [28.58, 31.99]$. The panel 4 indicates environmental factor for type of house do not significantly across the three ranges of house types, $F(2, 53) = .255, p(.776) > 0.05$. The comparisons of the three levels indicate that the types of house $M = R1=82.86, R2=86.55, R3=83.70, CI 95\% [80.57, 88.86]$. The overall quality of life for type of house do not significantly differ the three ranges of house types, $F(2, 53) = .394, p(.676) > 0.05$. The evaluation of the three levels indicate that the types of house $M = R1=68.29, R2=72.00, R3=70.96, CI 95\% [68.48, 73.59]$. The overall analysis of the above table 7 clearly examined the Street Vendor's house statuses the above all the four variables are not significantly difference with Street Vendor's quality of life. Hence the research hypothesis (H_1) rejected. So, the null hypothesis accepted (H_0).

M1= Road, M2= Open, M3= Door to Door: A one-way ANOVA was used to test for overall quality of life variance among three levels of respondent's sales areas. Physical health for sales areas do not significantly differ the three ranges of sales areas, $F(2, 53) = 2.157, p(.126) > 0.05$. The comparisons of the three levels indicate that the types of house $M = M1=84.00, M2=75.48, M3=74.67, CI 95\% [73.92, 82.08]$. The psychological health for sales areas differed significantly across

the three ranges of sales areas, $F(2, 53) = 6.130, p(.004) < 0.01$. The comparisons of the three levels indicate that the types of house $M = M1=76.22, M2=65.22, M3=63.73, CI 95\% [64.96, 71.75]$. The social relationship for sales areas differed no significantly across the three ranges of sales areas, $F(2, 53) = 1.564, p(.219) > 0.05$. The comparisons of the three levels indicate that the types of house $M = M1=32.44, M2=29.39, M3=29.07, CI 95\% [28.58, 31.99]$. The environmental factor for sales areas differed no significantly across the three ranges of sales areas, $F(2, 53) = .601, p(.552) > 0.05$. The evaluation of the three levels indicate that the types of house $M = M1=88.00,$

$M2=83.48, M3=82.67, CI 95\% [80.57, 88.86]$. The overall quality of life for sales areas significantly differ the three ranges of sales areas, $F(2, 53) = 3.805, p(.029) < 0.05$. The comparisons of the three levels indicate that the types of house $M = M1=75.89, M2=68.43, M3=69.20, CI 95\% [68.48, 73.59]$. The overall analysis of the above Table 8 illustrated the value of psychological health factor are significantly differ and quality of life of Street Vendor has significant with 95% confident level and the remaining three variable were not significantly differ. Hence, the research hypothesis (H_1) was accepted.

Table – 7

One way analysis of variance among various House Statuses of the respondents with regard to their overall Quality of Life

S.No	House Status	Respondents =56				Statistical Inference
		DF	SS	MS	\bar{X}	
1	Physical Health					F=2.164 p(.125)>0.05 not Significant
	Between Groups	2	963.879	481.939	R1=68.00 R2=81.45 R3=77.78	
	Within Groups	53	11804.121	222.719		
2	Psychological Health					F=.249 p(.781)>0.05 not significant
	Between Groups	2	82.242	41.121	R1=69.14 R2=69.64 R3=67.11	
	Within Groups	53	8758.615	165.257		
3	Social Relationship					F=.351 p(.706)>0.05 not significant
	Between Groups	2	29.229	14.615	R1=28.57 R2=30.91 R3=30.22	
	Within Groups	53	2206.199	41.626		
4	Environment Factors					F=.255 p(.776)>0.05 not Significant
	Between Groups	2	125.487	62.744	R1=82.86 R2=86.55 R3=83.70	
	Within Groups	53	13061.941	246.452		
5	Overall Quality of Life					F=.394 p(.676)>0.05 not Significant
	Between Groups	2	73.537	36.769	R1=68.29 R2=72.00 R3=70.96	
	Within Groups	53	4944.392	93.290		

Table-8

One way analysis of variance among various Sales Areas of the respondents with regard to their overall Quality of Life

S.No	House Status	Respondents =56				Statistical Inference
		DF	SS	MS	\bar{X}	
1	Physical Health					F=2.157 p(.126)>0.05 not Significant
	Between Groups	2	960.928	480.464	M1=84.00 M2=75.48 M3=74.67	
	Within Groups	53	11807.072	222.775		
2	Psychological Health					F=6.130 p(.004)<0.01 significant
	Between Groups	2	1660.900	830.450	M1=76.22 M2=65.22 M3=63.73	
	Within Groups	53	7179.957	135.471		
3	Social Relationship					F=1.564 p(.219)>0.05 not significant
	Between Groups	2	124.573	62.286	M1=32.44 M2=29.39 M3=29.07	
	Within Groups	53	2110.856	39.827		
4	Environment Factors					F=.601 p(.552)>0.05 not Significant
	Between Groups	2	292.356	146.178	M1=88.00 M2=83.48 M3=82.67	
	Within Groups	53	12895.072	243.303		
5	Overall Quality of Life					F=3.805 p(.029)<0.05 Significant
	Between Groups	2	630.099	315.049	M1=75.89 M2=68.43 M3=69.20	
	Within Groups	53	4387.830	82.789		

Table- 9
Results of Correlation analysis among the variables of Street Vendor’s overall Quality of Life

	Age	Exp Year	Monthly saving	Physical Health	Psychological Health	Social Relationship	Environment	Overall Quality Life
Age								
Exp Year	** .621							
Monthly saving	** .522	* .338						
Physical Health	-.194	.067	-.012					
Psychological Health	* -.315	-.132	-.164	** .407				
Social Relationship	* -.303	-.239	-.104	** .344	.159			
Environment	* -.286	-.125	-.219	** .493	** .400	** .472		
Overall Quality Life	* -.295	-.052	-.100	** .800	** .672	** .574	** .813	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). * Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The above Table (table- 9) shows that the correlation matrix test (r) has been used to find out the quality of life will be interdependent and the other variables Age, Year of experience, Monthly saving, Physical Health, Psychological Health, Social Relationship and Environment Factors. The above Table clearly denoted the quality of life has been positively correlated with Physical Health, Psychological Health, Social Relationship and Environment with the value of (0.800**, 0.672**, 0.574** and 0.813**) respectively. And the other variables like Age, Year of Experience and Monthly saving was not positively relationship with the quality of life the rule of social work a human Age is increasing at the same time the quality of life will be decreased. And the same rule will be applicable for year of experience and monthly savings. The common rule has been clearly followed by this study. The analysis values (r=-0.295*, r=-0.052 and r=-0.100) has been shown the above table with quality of life. The above correlation Table (p value is significant that the variable p>0.05) correlated by all the variables with quality of life this correlation analysis will be fully covered as per researcher findings.

Major Findings: This study was fully focused on informal sectors in particular reference to Street Vendors socio-economic conditions and their Quality of Life (QOL). This study explains the following the major findings.

This study clarify one third of the (34%) respondents having the age group of 38-48, more than half of the (60%) respondents are female, less than half of the (45%) respondents have studied below 5th standard, more than half (52%) of the respondents are religion of Hindu. More than one third (38%) of the respondents are backward community (BC), Less than half of the (46%) respondents are married, more than half of the respondents are lived in single type family, More than half of the (55%) the

respondents are living in urban. This is the majority of the vendors migrated from rural to urban. Less than partly of the (48%) respondents are living in concrete house. More than half of the respondents (54 per cent) are having own house. And nearly one third of the respondents are (32%) selling their goods in fruits, more than one third of the (38%) respondents are selling their goods by their bicycle, and less than half of the respondents are selling their goods in road side. less than half (46%) of the respondents are monthly earning between Rs.1500- Rs.3000 and less than half of the (46%) respondent’s monthly expenditure is between Rs.1500- Rs.3000. More than half of the (64%) respondents are saving monthly Rs.500- Rs.1000.

Findings of Research Hypothesis: There is a significant difference between gender of the respondents and their overall Quality of Life that studies foremost Hypothesis (H₁) it was found that there is a significant difference between the gender categories and the quality of life. Hence, it was accepted at 5% significant level.

There is a significant difference between house status of the respondents and their overall Quality of Life that ‘t’ test clearly explained the above all the variables are not significant with Street Vendors quality of life. Hence the research hypothesis (H₁) is rejected. So, the null hypothesis is accepted (H₀).

There is a significant variance between Educational Qualification of the respondents and their overall Quality of Life that ANOVA table clearly explained the educational qualification of Street Vendor and variables of quality of life are not significant. Hence the research hypothesis (H₁) rejected. So, the null hypothesis is accepted (H₀).

There is a significant variance between living areas of the respondents and their overall Quality of Life that ANOVA table confirmed the Street Vendors living areas were the above four variables except environmental factors is not significantly difference with Street Vendor's quality of life. Hence the research hypothesis is (H_1) rejected. So, the null hypothesis is accepted (H_0).

There is a significant variance between types of house of the respondents and their overall Quality of Life ANOVA test clearly examined the Street Vendor's house statuses the above all the four variables are not significantly difference with Street Vendor's quality of life. Hence the research hypothesis is (H_1) rejected. So, the null hypothesis is accepted (H_0).

There is a significant variance between sales area of the respondents and their overall Quality of Life ANOVA test illustrated the value of psychological health factor is significantly differ and quality of life of Street Vendor has significant with 95% confident level and the remaining three variables were not significantly differing. Hence, the research hypothesis is (H_1) was accepted.

There is significant correlation between the age of the respondents and their overall Quality of Life (p value is significant that the variable $p > 0.05$) correlated by all the variables with quality of life this correlation analysis will be fully covered as per researcher findings.

Suggestions: Nowadays Government and Non-Governmental Organization are taking care of the weaker section, but sometimes they misusing their responsibilities. This study gives some suggestions to improve the Street Vendor's livelihood. The Government should give proper ID cards to the Street Vendors. Government should provide commercial building to Street Vendors for monthly low rental and open in some eminent streets. Government should take some action against those people, who harass them in their life (especially police personnel). Their working patterns are very danger to their body (due to climatic conditions). Hence, the government should provide special Health schemes, Welfare schemes and Livelihood programmes for the Street Vendors. Local body and police should be oriented to support Street Vendors to do their business without hampering the normal course of activities of the people. They should inculcate habit of savings to improve their economic conditions. The common people can provide the good ideas and suggestions to improve their goods. Their psychological health and physical health are seem to be taken care of their business after that they are expanded their environmental factors, and social relationship to develop their Quality of Life.

Conclusion

Street Vendors are the integral part of human society. These people are to be looked after by the individuals, group and communities. Even though they have this type of occupation, their day to day life is not safe. Government should take active roles to implement the policies effectively which they have made. Hence, the government should look in to the problems of the street vendor's each and every corner of life. As professional social workers, it is our duty and obligation to work for the well being of the Street Vendors.

Reference

1. Robert L. and Tignor., Arthur Lewis w and the 'Birth of Development Economics', *Princeton University Press, America* (2005)
2. Sharit K. and Bhowmi K., Hawkers and the Urban Informal Sector: A Study of Street Vending in seven cities, *National Alliance of Street Vendors of India (NASVI)* (1998)
3. Tamil Nadu Government., Tiruchirappalli District, Retrieved November 10, 2012, from <http://www.trichy.tn.nic.in/distprof.htm> (2011)
4. National Association of Street Vendors of India., definition of street vending, Retrieved October 18, 2012, from <http://nasvinet.org/newsite/defining-street-vendors/> (2012)
5. Kishor C. and Samal., Indian National Commission on Labor, *Urban Informal Sector, Manak Publication Pvt.Ltd, Jaipur* (1990)
6. The Times of India., Plan to bring together street vendors in Trichy, Retrieved January 29, 2013 from, http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2013-02-02/madurai/36702739_1_street-vendors-terror-of-municipal-bodies-trichy (2013)
7. WHO, *Quality Of Life-BREF four dimensional scales. World Health Organisation press, Jeneva* (2004)
8. Aloysius B. G., Vulnerability of Urban Informal Sector: Street Vendors in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *MPRA Paper No. 12541, Indonesia* (2008)
9. Debdulal S., Conditions of 'decent working life' of Street Vendors in Mumbai. Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Retrieved January 22, 2013 from, http://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/protection/travail/pdf/r_dwpaper27c.pdf (2013)
10. Surjit S., Urban Informal Sector, Institute of Development Studies, *Rawat Publication, Jaipure and New Delhi* (1994)